

CLEO TIDWELL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 18-10262-LTS
)	
LAWRENCE PRISON, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

February 15, 2018

For the reasons stated below, the Court dismisses this action.

Article III of the Constitution limits the judicial power of federal courts to deciding actual “Cases” or “Controversies.” U.S. Const. art. III, § 2. “In other words, for a federal court to have authority under the Constitution to settle a dispute, the party before it must seek a remedy for a personal and tangible harm.” Hollingsworth v. Perry, 570 U.S. 693, --, 133 S. Ct 2652, 2661 (2013). Here, Tidwell does not present a “case” or “controversy.” While he does allege that the

defendants have violated his rights under the First Amendment, he does not seek a remedy therefor. The plaintiff merely asks that the Court acknowledge receipt of his pleading.

Further, even if Tidwell had sought redress for his alleged injury, the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over the defendants and venue does not exist in the District of Massachusetts.¹

Accordingly, this action is DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Leo T. Sorokin
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The Court notes that Tidwell is enjoined from filing a new action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois until he pays a \$500 sanction. See Tidwell v. Clendenin, C.A. No. 3:16-00384, ECF No. 43 (S.D. Ill. August 10, 2017).